Black on the Bill of Rights, P. 2

Liberal Democrats Silent But Two Peace Congressman Challenge the Arms Race Budget, P. 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VII, NO. 24 JUNE 22, 1959 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Meet the State Dept's New Chief for Far Eastern Affairs

If J. Graham Parsons our new Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs had once given $5 to help Loyalist Spain or been on the mailing list of the Washington Bookshop, one may be sure the FBI would have brought it to the attention of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. As it is Parsons managed to get himself unanimously endorsed by the committee in executive session on May 26, and approved by the Senate without discussion on June 5 although as Ambassador to Laos from 1955 to 1957 he presided over what was probably the sloppiest and most corrupt of all our mutual security operations. Assistant Secretary of State Robertson, who picked Parsons as his successor, admitted to the House Foreign Affairs Committee that the aid program in Laos "has probably received more adverse publicity than any one that we have ever had. The GAO made a report. . . . There was a highly critical article in the *Wall Street Journal*, which was also published in the Reader's Digest." All this might just as well have been stamped top secret. Even Senator Morse in committee commended the the President "for selecting someone with this background in the career service."

An Auditor "Unable to Adjust"

The background appears in a report on Laos by the Porter Hardy subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations. The report, released just ten days after the Senate confirmed Parsons, tells a story of bribery, perjury, and wasted millions which doubled the cost of living in Laos and enriched a small clique of merchants and officials. A GAO (General Accounting Office) auditor who dug too far into this mess for the comfort of U. S. officials "was 'railroaded' out of Laos," the House subcommittee report concludes, "because he was close to discovering the truth about Universal [Construction Co.], its monopoly of U. S. aid construction projects in Laos, its bribes, and its woefully inadequate performance." The auditor, Haynes Miller (he told his story in *The Reporter* last November 13), was declared "unable to adjust", and invited to resign, according to a telegram by then Ambassador Parsons, "because of obvious signs of nervous disorder." On his return to Washington, after a full medical examination, he was declared qualified for general duty and offered another job but quit in disgust.

The subcommittee contrasted the treatment accorded U. S. Operations Mission Director Carter de Paul. De Paul was allowed by Parsons, over protests from other officials, to sell a broken down Cadillac worth less than $600 to the Universal Construction Company for $3,000. De Paul, "violated ICA contract regulations" in dealing with Universal, and told the subcommittee a false story under oath about the car transaction. "Uncontroverted evidence indicates the vehicle was at that time inoperable, and shortly thereafter it was cut up and the pieces dropped down an abandoned well. In the interim," the subcommittee report says, "it had stood rusting in front of Universal's main office, where it was the subject of scornful amusement by Lao and Americans alike." This sounds like an episode from "The Ugly American." De Paul was rewarded by promotion to Deputy Assistant to the Director of ICA, on matters concerning the National Security Council. Such are the mysteries of promotion in our bureaucracy.

> **How U. S. Aid—Aided the Reds**
>
> **"The concentration of the benefits of the aid program to the area around Vientiane . . . and the enrichment of, and speculation by, Lao merchants and public officials . . . tended to lend credence to the Communist allegation that the Royal Lao Government was 'corrupt' and 'indifferent' to the needs of the people."**
>
> *—U.S. Aid Operations in Laos, Report to the House by the Porter Hardy subcommittee.*

Robertson recommended Parsons highly but when Congressman William H. Meyer (*D. Vt.*) asked him at a House Foreign Affairs hearing April 21 about the Universal Construction Company scandal in Laos and whether Parsons had approved its transactions, Robertson replied "I can't answer the questions because I don't know the facts." When Chairman Morgan asked whether Mr. Parsons "has been back to testify" before the Porter Hardy subcommittee, Robertson replied, "He appeared before them for two days," he said, "and they have a full record of his testimony." An inconsistent but equally misleading reply was made by the State Department spokesman last Monday when questioned about the Porter Hardy report by reporters: "Parsons wrote twice to Congressman Hardy offering to testify on this subject." The facts, as Hardy put them before the House next day, are that Parsons appeared before the subcommittee on March 18 and 19 at the very beginning of its investigation. When later witnesses developed the unseemly side of the whole Laos operation, Hardy invited Parsons to return. Reply No. 1, dated April 3, was that he had to go to Australia on official business. Reply No. 2, dated May 20, was that he thought the hearings were over. The truth is that State Department Congressional liaison decided it would be better for Parsons to stay away.

The prize joke of Parsons' service in Laos was the creation — against the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff — of a 25,000-man army. This, with a 5,000-man constabulary, is now unable to cope with one battalion of 800 Communists, but that is another story. So is the mystery of how all this was kept a secret from the usually vigilant Senate Foreign Relations Committee until after it had safely approved this choice State Department candidate for top post in the area where peace is most fragile.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Humphrey Provides First Expose of Those Growing "Deletions" in Congressional Hearings

How the Army Tried to Censor Testimony on Its Limited Nuclear War Games

Those who read Congressional hearings know with what increasing frequency one encounters, without explanation, that tell-tale notation "deleted." All kinds of information is censored out of the public versions of executive committee testimony. In a statement before the Special House Subcommittee on Government Information last Monday, Senator Humphrey provided the first documented study of this censorship. His statement was based on the experience of his Senate disarmament subcommittee, one of the few which puts up a fight with the censors. The Senator advised other Congressional committees to do the same, charging that often the deletions have nothing to do with real security considerations.

CIA Disagreed With Hans Bethe

Among the instances cited by Humphrey was a CIA censor who tried to delete testimony of Dr. Hans Bethe on earthquakes in China because he claimed it was "incorrect." The testimony was restored. The AEC tried to delete testimony by one of its own officials saying there was no evidence the Soviets were experimenting with so-called "clean" nuclear weapons. The State Department tried to delete testimony regarding overseas bases "because it seemed irrelevant." The Defense Department tried to delete testimony on Operation Sage Brush, the "limited" nuclear war maneuvers in Louisiana in 1955, though much of the information had already been leaked by the Army to Hanson Baldwin of the *New York Times*.

Senator Humphrey said, "Part of the reason why the Army wished to continue to classify the information, according to one officer, was that the results indicated the Army didn't quite know what it was doing in the maneuvers. Even if this were true, said the officer, the information should not be released." The Army also tried to censor out several portions of testimony by its own Chief of Staff, Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, but finally restored 90 percent of the cuts. These ranged from a discussion of the need for non-atomic weapons to his views on the psychological impact of a nuclear test ban on world opinion.

The Senator urged more Congressional committees to be "vigilant" in demanding explanations from the anonymous censors who swarm in the executive agencies of the government. One problem he did not discuss is that of committees like Appropriations which are under pressure to get their hearings out fast for floor votes on money bills. The staffs simply do not have time to dicker with the executive agencies which are past masters at slow motion delaying tactics. Consequently they get away with a wide range of unnecessary censorship in hearings dealing with military and mutual security matters. This is a new and growing evil.

Earthquakes Military Secrets?

Senator Humphrey complained to the House Subcommittee on Government Information that his Senate disarmament subcommittee "has never received a satisfactory explanation" as to why the Government continues to censor so much information on seismology, the study of earthquakes and earth waves. The Senator said more information should be made available because of its relevance to the problem of detecting underground testing and the feasibility of a control system. He indicated that the supposed "Berkner Report" released June 12 actually included only "some material" contained in it.

Humphrey said some scientists recently in the USSR say the Russians are doing more in the field of seismology than we are. Humphrey said an expanded research program is necessary to provide "a better conception of the capabilities of a control system." Maybe the Pentagon and AEC fear a better conception would allay the apprehensions they have fostered about the possibility of adequate controls.

Text of New 5-4 Liberal Dissent by Black Protesting Erosion of Basic Rights

"In re Groban, 352 US 330, decided two years ago, upheld as constitutional the action of a state fire marshal in compelling persons suspected of burning a building to testify about the fire in secret and without benefit of the presence of their counsel. Four of us [Black, Warren, Douglas and Brennan] dissented on the ground that such secret inquisitions violated the Due Process Clause of the 14th Amendment. In this [new] case the Court upholds the action of a State judge in compelling testimony from persons suspected of getting statements of defendants in negligence cases under false pretenses and later 'tampering' with these statements. I think it violates due process for a judge no less than for a fire marshal to compel testimony to be given incommunicado. In fact it was Star Chamber judges who helped to make closed-door court proceedings so obnoxious in this country that the Bill of Rights guarantees public trials and the assistance of counsel. And secretly compelled testimony does not lose its highly dangerous potentialities merely because it represents only a 'preliminary inquisition . . . whereby the court is given information that may move it to other acts thereafter.' Nor does this record justify a holding that this inquisition adopted the mantle of secrecy and barred counsel from the room out of tender solicitude for the reputation of the defendants in this contempt case. Doubtless the defendants' lawyers and the defendants themselves are at least as capable and perhaps as much interested in saving thir reputations as the judge who is sending them to jail.

"The naked, stark issue here is whether a judge, who must actually try cases in public—or any other government official for that matter—can consistently with due process compel persons to testify and perhaps to lay the groundwork for their later conviction of crime, in secret chambers, where counsel for the State can be present but where counsel for the suspect cannot. In upholding such secret inquisitions the Court once again retreats from what I conceive to be its highest duty, that of maintaining unimpaired the rights and liberties guaranteed by the 14th Amendment and the Bill of Rights. Cf. Bartkus v. Illinois, 359 US 121 [double jeopardy]; Frank v. Maryland [inspection without search warrant]; Barenblatt v. U. S. [contempt of House Un-American Committee]; Uphaus v. Wyman [State witch-hunt]. Here as in Groban my answer would be that no public official can constitutionally exercise such a dangerous power over any individual. I would therefore reverse this conviction."

—Anon. v. Baker, June 15, 1959, dissent by Black, in which Warren, Douglas and Brennan joined.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Liberal Democrats Sit Silent and Vote Yes on Astronomical Arms Race Billions

Two Peace Congressmen Challenge the Rubber Stamp Vote on "Defense"

The House of Representatives passed the annual defense budget 393-3 on June 3 after two days of ill-attended debate, though the $38 billion appropriated is so staggering that as Ostertag (R. N. Y.) pointed out, "if you spent $1,000,000 a day, it would take 110 years to spend that amount." No challenge came from the liberals and the real issue of whether this huge expenditure on the arms race would safeguard peace or assure war was only discussed by two first term maverick Democrats. One was Byron Johnson, a University of Denver economics professor who campaigned on a peace platform, and is a member of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. The other was William H. Meyer, a Vermont forester, who also waged an unusual peace campaign. Only they spoke for the conscience of a humane and less fearful America. We give a glimpse of their speeches on this page. Another first term Democrat, Randall S. Harmon, of Muncie, Indiana, joined them in voting against the arms budget. A U. A. W. tool engineer, who worked for General Motors, Harmon told friends he cast a protest vote because he knew of cases in which already obsolete armament went from the factory straight to the scrap heap. Harmon also voted against the draft. An abridged version of Johnson's speech of June 3 follows:

"Mr. Chairman, I think the time has come in our national existence when we must re-examine the meaning of common defense. If our nation used its atomic arsenal, and our adversary did not retaliate, we would destroy not only our adversary but hundreds of millions of neutrals, and millions of our own people as well, from the effects of radioactivity.

"This represents a practical reason, in addition to the overwhelming moral reasons, for ruling out preventive or preemptive war. If our adversary were to retaliate, as many as half of the population of the United States might well be vaporized within six hours of the outbreak of hostilities and another one-fourth might be stricken by radioactivity.

"To speak of preparation for such a war as common defense is to believe that neither side will ever resort to the use of the weapons with which each is provided. Yet it is the history of every arms race that it has ended in hostilities in which the arms are employed.

"Mr. Chairman, we must provide for the common defense, not merely of our Nation, but, even more, of the right of human life to exist on earth. It was said that justice consisted of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. In this budget, we are preparing to raise that law to a civilization for a civilization. And yet the man from Galillee gave us a new law that you overcome evil with good.

The Nightmare to Which We Drift

"In considering the horrible results which would ensue from a general atomic war, General Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was asked a question as to the effect of a surprise atomic attack upon the United States. In response he said: 'It would be beyond one's imagination to know how bad it would be. Whether the people will crack, or go crazy or not I don't know. There would be a lot left, I think, who would get back together again but it would be a different kind of a world, a different life'."

—House Approp. Com. Report, 1960 Defense Budget.

"Mr. Chairman, the total national defense and mutual security budget this year will require about $260 per capita in the United States. The world's population today is something over two and a half billion persons. Every year we are spending $18 for every man, woman and child on the face of the globe in preparing for man's destruction.

"Yet the Congress appropriated last year only $50,000 for the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament to work on alternatives to the arms race. The Communist offensive now is increasingly one of economic aid and penetration. For economic aid [of all kinds] these appropriations amounted to little more than $1.4 billion. That represents $8 per U. S. citizen, or about 50 cents per capita globally.

All in The Name of Peace

"We are told this is a peace budget. Peace will be built, not by terror, but by the settlement of disputes by peaceful *means—however difficult negotiations may be—by all-out* support of the United Nations, and by earnest support of general disarmament. The hundreds of millions of hungry persons in Asia and Africa cannot eat our bayonets, do not want to be blanketed with fall-out from our bombs.

"I submit, Mr. Chairman, that in providing for the common defense we are operating too heavily from our fears and too little from our faith. This generation has it within its power to attack successfully man's ancient enemies—hunger, misery, illiteracy, disease and poverty. If we could significantly reduce this military budget and apply only a third of the budget to a global war on these enemies, I believe that we would by so doing more truly provide for our common defense."

Billions Voted With Little Debate in An Almost Empty House of Representatives

"We do not know very much about where we are going. We do not know very much about a military or defense program for this country. We have not gotten anywhere in developing a unified service that would promote economy. As we talk about strategy and things of that kind, it seems most clear to me that we are unable to depart from old ideas and we accept the new fetish of a military deterrent. I am certain that this country is going to have a very rude awakening. In the meantime, we are spending and wasting our substance. For every $3 we spend, we could do the same job for $2. We have about $60 billion of obsolete equipment.

"In all the debate we have had, we develop nothing but propaganda, a war spirit and a spirit of hate. These old military methods will not work, yet we do not have the courage to find a new way. When people want to speak a little bit about a different way, they do not get the time to speak. I was rather ashamed as I sat around yesterday afternoon to note that there were about 26 members on the floor of the House when we were discussing a bill which includes more than 50 percent of the budget of the U. S.

What interest do we have in the welfare of the American people if only about 26 of us will sit here when such a subject is discussed? What use is there in such a debate? I know I will get the gavel pretty quickly. So I think I will sit down, but I think it is about time this Congress does something constructive about the issue of war and peace, and not keep on voting billions of dollars and throwing about one-third of those dollars down the drain."

—Wm. H. Meyer, D. Vt. in the House, June 3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Judge Prettyman Thinks Up Some Prize Arguments for Passport Control

Time to Inhibit Those "Yens" We Derive From the First Amendment

An anthology of a kind could be compiled from Chief Judge Prettyman's decision in the Court of Appeals here upholding the denial of a passport to William Worthy, Jr., the young Negro journalist who had the audacity (from the State Department's point of view) to visit China in 1955. Renewal of his passport was denied in 1957 when he declined to promise that he would never again visit any other country declared off limits by the Department.

The Judge begins by complaining that the "simple, succinct phrases of the Bill of Rights," which he terms "indestructible protections to some of the fundamentals of our way of life," have been "expanded by rhetorical inflation beyond all semblance to the realities with which they were meant to deal." He then proceeds to argue that "Liberty itself is inherently a restricted thing." (If liberty is "inherently" restricted, what is *lack* of liberty inherently?)

Human Sacrifices and Annie Oakleys

Judge Prettyman thinks up a series of horrible examples. He says "A man with a contagious disease can be locked in his house." He argues "Merely because a newsman has a right to travel does not mean he can go anywhere he wishes. He cannot attend . . . meetings of the President's Cabinet . . . or enter a ball park without a ticket of admission." He says even "freedom of worship as one chooses is restricted in some ways. Worship by human sacrifice is forbidden." We just can't wait until the Druids file for certiorari.

In defending the right to forbid travel into certain areas, Judge Prettyman says "the plight of airmen who have crossed borders, and the tense crises thereby created, are recent common knowledge. Surely the Executive can forbid such crossings. . . ." (The only problem is to get the Air Force and the CIA to obey the orders).

"In foreign affairs," the Judge rules, "especially in the intimate posture of today's world of jets, radio and atomic power, an individual's uninhibited yen to go and to inquire may be circumscribed." That "uninhibited yen," we believe, used to be called an inquiring mind.

In Judge Prettyman's opinion, the authority to determine where one may travel "is not vested in individual citizens, even though they be newsmen, any more than authority to declare a damaged wall in a newsman's home town dangerous. . . . The Fire Chief determines that condition and enforces his conclusion." Hail to The (Fire) Chief!

On these luminous principles, the State Department should be able not only to deny Mr. Worthy an unrestricted passport but to bar him from its press conferences. Reporters like him have been making our Wall (if the Chinese have one, why can't we?) dangerously unsteady. Like any good Fire Chief, the Secretary of State may refuse to recognize his reporter's credentials and order him kept at a safe distance.

Judge Prettyman would agree, we feel sure, that the uninhibited yen to write about foreign policy may be as dangerous as the yen to travel and should be regulated—just like all those other "yens" in the First Amendment.

As Libertarian As Old Queen Bess

In the Free State of Maryland founded to give persecuted English Catholics a haven, a Baltimore Sun columnist last Monday morning discovered that the Barenblatt and Uphaus decisions are "in our central libertarian tradition" since Queen Elizabeth enacted "security laws against 'papists'" and John Milton in appealing to Parliament for religious toleration expressly excluded Catholics on the ground that their religion was "but a Roman principalitie . . . endeavoring to keep up her old universal dominion."

In penalizing religious non-conformity "the English kings and parliamentarians," the Baltimore Sun columnist argued, "were not pursuing men for their ideas any more than was Monday's majority of the Supreme Court." They were merely making a distinction between "faith and . . . sedition." This revision of history neatly matches the Frankfurter-Harlan revision of the First Amendment. We now expect to hear the saga of the Pilgrim Fathers and the story of Lord Calvert retold as episodes in misguided contumacy. It would appear that Plymouth Rock was that place where seditionists landed, seeking in the wilderness a place to carry on with impunity their evil plottings against the English Crown.

You Can Have A Free Copy of Our 1958 Index If You Send A Self-Addressed Stamped Envelope

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

6/22/59

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No. ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED